

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
DECEMBER 2, 2020**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Chair
Jän Simon, Vice Chair
Brian Andersen
David Blaser
William Fay
Tyler Jones
Noah Mundt
Anthony Bianchi, Alternate (Via Webex)

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Colby Ashton, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Stephanie Bubenheim, Senior Planner
Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Keith Newman, Planner II
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

MAYOR AND COUNCIL PRESENT:

Mayor-elect Brigitte Peterson
Councilmember Scott September

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Carl Bloomfield called the December 2, 2020 Study Session to order at 5:03 p.m.

- 1. DR20-96 3XB LLC: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately .90 acres, generally located south of the southwest corner of Merrill Ave. and Marvin Ct., and zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

Planner Keith Newman presented DR20-96 3XB LLC for Design Review. The site is located in the Fuller Industrial Park which is south of the Shoppes at Gilbert Commons. The proposal is for a new office/warehouse building. The applicant is requesting general input as they have requested to proceed with Construction Documents at Risk.

The applicant is proposing a new 5,600 SF building with 3,100 SF of office space and a 25K SF warehouse component at the end of a cul-de-sac off of Marvin Court. The site is just under an acre. The building will be centrally located on the site with parking on the east and south sides. The applicant is proposing 29 parking stalls where 17 are required. Landscaping is provided along the southern perimeter, the eastern boundary, and a little on the north. Per the LDC, sites with outdoor storage or service areas that are behind completely enclosed walls are not required to have landscaping on certain boundaries. In this situation, the north and west boundaries are not required to have the landscape setback. The south boundary is adjacent to a single-family residential zoning district and is required to have a 25' landscape setback and a 75' building setback along the southern boundaries, where the other boundaries are zero. The applicant has submitted a variance request which will be heard next week to reduce the building setback from 75' to 48'-

8". They are also proposing to reduce the landscape setback along the southern boundary from 25' to 8'9". The variance request is driven by the fact that there is a 38' wide parcel that used to be owned by SRP with an irrigation ditch that provides additional separation from the residential.

The two-story office area and lobby will be on the east side with the warehouse component on the west side. The metal building is proposed at approximately 28' in height with windows, metal roofing and siding. The colors are grays and white. There will be two garage doors on the north elevation and one on the west elevation. No garage doors are permitted on the south elevation facing the residential. The lighting will produce zero foot-candles along all property boundaries except for the parking area.

The applicant has requested to move forward with CDs at Risk and is looking for approval from the Planning Commission.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Fay had no concerns on the southern boundary, particularly as it lines up with the existing buildings to the east and west, which he felt were packed into that space. The size and space are consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. He was not concerned at all about the irrigation ditch on the south side. He noted the drainage is stated as going to a common spot which is not specified. It looks like it drains to a manhole in the southeast corner. When this comes forward outside of Study Session, he would like to see the drainage addressed with some specificity. It could drain to the north into the empty lots that are probably not restricted and he did not want it to drain out to the street. He was not at all concerned about the requested setbacks, particularly on the south side.

Vice Chair Simon echoed Commissioner Fay's comments. Since it lines up with the buildings next door, he had no issues with the southern boundary. He liked the look of the building. It is fresh and a little bit different. He was excited to see the product go in.

Chair Bloomfield agreed with the prior comments. He liked the style, the use, and liked that there is a new project coming into this area that has been vacant for quite a while. It looks like it will be a great project and will bring a few more jobs for Gilbert.

2. DR20-144 PARK LUCERO EAST: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 36.7 acres, generally located at the northeast corner of Mustang Drive and Germann Road, and zoned Light Industrial (LI).

Commissioner Blaser stated he would abstain from the discussion on Item 2. DR20-144. Chair Bloomfield advised that he could remain on the dais as it was a Study Session item and there would be no vote.

Planner Sydney Bethel presented DR20-144 Park Lucero East located west of Lindsay and Germann Roads and directly south of the 202 freeway. This project is intended to be a mirror of the existing Park Lucero project developed in 2014 located directly west of the subject site. Staff is looking for general feedback from the Planning Commission regarding the elevations, allowing decorative lighting above 14' and allowing the applicant to proceed with Construction Documents at Risk.

The applicant is proposing three industrial shell buildings ranging from just over 100K SF to just over 300K SF for a total of over 500K SF of new industrial building area. Docking stations are located in the center of Buildings A and B and on the north and south sides of Building C. There is one main point of access off

Germann Road on the northern portion of the site. There will be five points of access off Mustang Drive that will align with the existing Park Lucero development to the west.

The applicant has provided ample landscaping at over 21%, above the requirement for the Light Industrial zoning district. Landscaping has been provided externally around the perimeter of the site and internally in a retention area. Two amenity areas for employees are located in the center of the retention area and on the west side of Building C. There will be a 15' compacted granite trail located along the 202 freeway as a continuation of an existing trail system that continues to the other Park Lucero site.

All of the buildings have the same colors and materials. Building A fronts onto Germann Road and will be the most visible building of the development. The applicant has revised some items based on staff's first review comments, including the articulation of the roofline and horizontal articulation of the pop-outs. The applicant increased the fine articulation of the front of Building A along Germann Road from a 2' projection above the roofline to 3' to 5' depending on the location. Building B and C were not modified during the second review and all of staff's comments regarding the elevations still stand. On Building C, the north elevation will be visible from the 202 freeway and there are some external downspouts on both the north and south elevations. This is something that is not permitted for commercial buildings but is permitted in some situations on industrial buildings. Staff would prefer if the downspouts were internalized due to the high visibility. Staff also recommended increased articulation of the roofline as well as additional horizontal articulation due to the visibility from the highway. The existing Park Lucero to the west was shown for comparison. It is very similar in design, colors and materials.

The LDC does not permit building-mounted lighting above 14', although the Design Review Board or Planning Commission may allow lighting to be above 14' as long as it meets two findings. Staff does support the proposed decorative lighting fixtures.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Bloomfield asked which of the two required findings would apply to the lighting request.

Ms. Bethel stated they are using the decorative lighting to accentuate architectural features of the building, the pop-outs and corrugated metal, which meets Finding A. Finding B states that the lighting shall not be placed on the side designated for residential use in the General Plan. The applicant is not proposing any lighting that would face residential and meets Finding B. It is an additional provision in the code that allows the applicant to pursue this with approval of the Commission.

Commissioner Andersen agreed with staff's comments on the articulation requested. He had no issue with the downspouts that are visible to the freeway. The light fixtures above 14' meet all of the findings.

Chair Bloomfield looked at the north side facing the freeway. It is a look we don't see anywhere else in the town on the freeway. In Park Lucero West, it is the front of the building where customers enter, where this will be back of house and filled with semi-trucks. There will be 8' site walls although it may be seen looking down from the freeway. His only question was whether it meets the guidelines and requirements of the town.

Commissioner Jones liked how the project on the west has developed. It is a great project given these are industrial/manufacturing buildings. He liked the changes to the roofline that staff and the applicant worked on. He would suggest doing something along the north side as well to make it look a little better, perhaps a better mix of materials to fit in better with the area. Overall, he felt the lighting made sense.

Ms. Bethel asked whether the Commission was comfortable with the applicant proceeding forward with CDs at risk, subject to the comments tonight being incorporated into that submittal.

Chair Bloomfield stated it was fine to proceed with CDs at Risk.

- 3. GP20-04 LAMB LANE: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 5.0 acres generally located west of the southwest corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads from Residential > 2-3.5 DU/Acre to Residential > 8-14 DU/Acre. The effect of this amendment will be to change the plan of development to allow increased density of residential development.**

Z20-09 LAMB LANE: Request to rezone approximately 5.0 acres of real property generally located west of the southwest corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads from Single Family-35 (SF-35) zoning district to Multi-Family/Low (MF/L) zoning district with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district (PAD) to modify maximum building height, minimum landscape setbacks and minimum common open space requirements. The effect will be to permit a multi-family housing development.

DR20-126 LAMB LANE: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 4.55 acres, generally located west of the southwest corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads, and pending zoned approval of Multi-Family/Low (MF/L) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Senior Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented GP20-04 Lamb Lane with three separate cases, a Minor General Plan Amendment, rezone and Design Review. The approximately 5 acre infill site is located west of the southwest corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads and is one of the last sites in the general area to be developed. The southwest corner of Ray and Val Vista is currently under construction for Andalucía Villas and at the northeast corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads Hampton Court is under construction with a similar product type. To the north across Ray Road is the Western Skies Golf Course and subdivision. To the west is an LDS church and the Spring Tree subdivision. To the southeast is the Ashland Ranch subdivision. Staff is requesting input on the zoning deviations, the overall colors, materials and styles of the units, the articulation of the west elevations, and the pavers. Staff's concern is that there be enough differentiation between the driving and pedestrian areas in the proposed courts of the units.

The existing land use is Residential 2-3.5 DU/Acre and the request is to increase the density to Residential 8-14 DU/Acre to fit the product type. The current zoning is SF-35 and the request is to rezone to Multi-Family/Low with a PAD for the deviations requested. The applicant is also proposing a development plan as part of the rezoning request. The main drive aisle will end in a cul-de-sac along the east side of the property with 41 units in four different buildings with amenity areas to the south.

The applicant is requesting deviations to change the height under MF/L from 36' to 24' and to limit the product to one story. There are no deviations being requested for building setbacks. The landscape setbacks on the east and south sides are requested to change from the 20' requirement to an 8' minimum on the east and a 6' minimum on the south. The reason for that request is that the main drive aisle ends in a cul-de-sac which enlarges the area to the southeast of the site. The distance from the eastern drive aisle to the property line is 17.5'. For a majority of the east side, they are showing a 17.5' wide landscape area. It is due to the cul-de-sac area that they are requesting to lower the setback. They are proposing a larger setback from the property line to the north along the frontage from 20' to 25' and from the west they are proposing a 25'

landscape setback instead of 20'. The minimum common open space in MF/L is typically 45% and the applicant is requesting 39.8%. The product looks and feels like single-family residential although it is actually multi-family rented units with front porches, driveways, one-car garages and private back yards. The applicant is requesting a deviation from the common open space requirement and will make that up by having the enlarged private open space. The total common and private open space will be 45.8%.

There are private courts that enter into the units. The units range from one to three bedrooms with a common playground area and dog park at the southwest corner. There are two different types of pavers to differentiate between the areas for vehicles and the pedestrian movement into the units. Staff is looking to ensure there is enough differentiation between those two areas. There is some retention along the frontage and the west side along the amenity trail, as well as the southwest corner that will act as a dog park.

In keeping with the single-family style, the applicant is proposing different elevation styles including Farmhouse, Ranch, Craftsman, and Cottage with different colors, materials and architectural details to make each unit unique. Staff is seeking input on the elevations along the west property line facing the amenity trail area. Since the staff report, the applicant has submitted updated elevations providing a few more windows along the west elevations. Staff asked if there was enough articulation on the west side compared to the other elevations. A rendering was provided of Hampton Court which is under construction with a similar type of product at the northeast corner of Val Vista and Ray Roads.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Blaser asked about the specific feedback staff was looking for regarding the pavers. It sounds like the difference in color will delineate the walking and driving paths.

Ms. Bubenheim stated staff's concern was that the pavers might not look different enough to define the areas where pedestrians would walk and where vehicles would drive. From a safety standpoint, staff wanted to ensure that the colors would not be too similar once constructed.

Commissioner Jones liked the project. He took a tour of the applicant's Chandler project and felt it was a nice product compared to traditional multi-family. He felt the zoning deviations made sense for this infill site. He liked the different colors and styles of the product. The west elevations seemed a **little plain** and **could be further enhanced**. He did not see much differentiation between the pavers and would push for those to **be a little more different** from each other. He spoke with the applicant about his concerns with the refuse concierge system where the cans are emptied five times a week. His other concern was that residents would use the street parking that is intended for guest parking. The applicant explained that there will be a strict requirement that tenants use their own driveways and garages and that will be enforced. The applicant also agreed to better tie in the sidewalk along Ray Road. On the community side, there was not much input, although the initial concern was being able to access the adjacent Ashland Ranch community. He understood that the fence will preclude that. Overall, he felt it was a great project.

Commissioner Blaser echoed those comments. He was not as concerned with adjusting the elevation on the west side. He felt it was a great product and that the requested deviations should be supported. There was a great explanation of why those deviations are needed. This is very atypical of an apartment complex in a positive direction. It will look and feel like single-family homes. He was in support of this project.

Commissioner Mundt felt it was a really cool project. He also spoke with the developer. Although he felt this was very tight, there is a market for this in individuals who don't want the responsibility of a single-family home or the financial implications. These units have a very nice feel. He saw a drone flyover of their

other site and it does look good. He did not feel the applicant was asking too much. It would be awesome to have more green space with this many families jammed into an area. There is the private green space behind the units, although you don't want people accessing the surrounding areas. The parking could end up being an issue, although they have addressed it and it should be manageable. It is a very nice product and as an infill it does quite well in this area.

Vice Chair Simon noted that we always talk about infill and zoning and he felt it makes sense here. He was in favor of the zoning piece. For the pavers, he suggested using different patterns and felt there was enough variation in the coloring that it will produce the desired effect. It is a great product and he liked the look of it.

Commissioner Fay felt Commissioner Mundt hit many of his points but came to the opposite conclusion. He felt the parking will be a bear and the only reason the variances are needed is because they are packing too much into too small of a site. The trailer park to the south on Gilbert Road is a similar project. He felt this was too heavy a lift for this site. They are trying to pack too much into it and two years or two tenant iterations down the road it will be a mess. The Town has positioned itself to get a higher quality and not squeeze every drop of life out of some of these projects. He had no concerns with the elevations or the pavers, although he was not in support of the open space deviations.

Chair Bloomfield felt from a General Plan perspective, this is an infill piece and the last of the Riggs family property. This developer has been very active in the area with two other projects within a half mile of this site. He was curious about the neighborhood feedback.

Ms. Bubenheim advised that the applicant held a virtual neighborhood meeting a couple months ago and 44 people attended including staff and the development team. Some input was provided afterward through email and she can include that in her next staff report. A second in-person meeting was held outdoors on the site and one person attended from the Western Skies development north of Ray Road. There were not too many concerns other than the traffic. There was input from two homes along the southwest corner of the site as their back yards abut the property. The applicant has been working with the two homeowners and has located the buildings further from the west property line and has provided additional landscaping.

Chair Bloomfield felt the west side elevations did have a little more landscape setback with the 25' and it is adjacent to a church parking lot except for those two homes. This applicant typically does a great job and is well-known as a good developer in town. This is their niche and they have a lot of market research to justify their plans. It will provide an alternate housing product for the area. He understood the concerns expressed in terms of parking, which he agreed will be an issue but there is no getting around it. He might disagree on this being a few iterations away from being tomorrow's slums. If it were single-family residential, then it would be up to the ownership of 100 people. As a single common ownership, they can update and spruce it up and keep it looking nice and fresh. He believed that is what would happen in this situation being a niche boutique type of community. He liked the zoning deviations and they have given some things in return and it is a good balance. From a General Plan and zoning perspective, he felt they have done their homework and he liked what he is seeing.

Commissioner Jones asked about the density of this project compared to the one in Chandler, which he felt worked really well.

Ms. Bubenheim has driven through the project in Chandler but did not know the acreage or density. She will look into it. This project is 8.2 DU/Acre which is on the low side of the density proposal for the land use classification.

- 4. Z20-11 - WATERSTON CENTRAL: Request to rezone approximately 143.31 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Val Vista Dr. and Ocotillo Rd. from Town of Gilbert Single Family-35 (SF-35) zoning district to 19.40 acres of Single Family-8 (SF-8), 54.82 acres of Single Family -7 (SF-7), 50.33 acres of Single Family-6 (SF-6), and 18.76 acres of Single Family-Detached (SF-D), all with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district. The effect will be to establish the overall development plan; to increase minimum lot area (SF-8, SF-7: Parcel 2, SF-6: Parcels 4 & 6, and SF-D); reduce minimum lot width (SF-8, SF-7 and SF-6: Parcels 4 & 6); reduce the minimum front yard setback (SF-6); increase minimum lot depth (SF-8, SF-7 and SF-6); reduce the minimum lot area (SF-6: Parcel 5); reduce the maximum building height (SF-D) and reduce side yard setback (SF-8).**

Planner Keith Newman presented Z20-11 Waterston Central rezoning request. The site is located at the southwest corner of Ocotillo Road and Val Vista Drive. It is in between two other Waterston projects to the north and south which are both Maracay Development neighborhoods. Waterston South is currently developing and Waterston North is just starting to develop. The site is approximately 143 acres. The applicant is not requesting a General Plan change as it is already 2-3.5 DU/Acre. The density is 3.3 DU/Acre and the project will have 468 lots. The zoning districts being proposed are SF-D, SF-6, SF-7 and SF-8, all with a Planned Area Development overlay. The applicant is requesting modifications for all four zoning districts.

The Development Plan shows the location of the different zoning categories being proposed. The main spine road comes off Val Vista Drive and goes up to 148 Street. Another spine road comes in off Ocotillo Road. There will be gates at the entrances to each neighborhood pod. The Waterston North development was approved as a completely gated community. This project will not be completely gated in order to allow for pedestrian and vehicular connectivity through the neighborhood moving east to west.

The SF-D is proposing to exceed the LDC standard by 1,000 SF in lot area and reduce the building height from 36' to 30'. The SF-6 is proposing a deviation for a 5,900 SF minimum lot area and a modification to allow deeper 108' lots instead of 100' lots. The lot sizes will be about the same as a 6,000 SF lot. A 5' deviation is being requested for the front building setback, although the garages will still be required to have a 20' setback to allow for a 20' driveway as required by the LDC. The 15' proposed setback is for the front porches and livable portion of the home and not the garage. Another parcel of SF-6 is proposing deeper lots of 123' with a 55' lot width, a reduction of 5' as well as the same 15' front yard setback. The SF-7 is proposing a deviation to decrease the lot width from 65' to 55' and a deeper lot of 128', which still meets the minimum lot area of 7,000 SF. The SF-8 is proposing a larger lot minimum of 9,000 SF and is requesting a deviation to reduce the minimum lot width by 10' to allow for deeper lots. The side setback is proposed at 5' and 10', where 10' is typically required on each side.

The Waterston North development has very similar lot sizes and virtually identical deviation requests. Staff is comfortable with the deviations requested and have no major concerns. Staff is requesting input on the deviations and the placement of community open space. Mr. Newman corrected a statement in the staff report and advised that the majority of SF-D is not located along the arterial roads, but is located in the northeast corner. The applicant's justification for these requests is to create a high-quality master-planned community similar to their project to the north. This is located in the San Tan Character Area adjacent to the City of Chandler with similar lot sizes and density.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Bloomfield felt Maracay has done a great job in developing what will be almost three-quarters of a mile as well as working on the main arterial along their frontage. They have contributed a lot to get this development done. He was glad to see this development continue and is excited for what it will bring to the town. He noted the next agenda item on Waterston North could have been switched in order to see what those products and deviations look like. There were a lot of deviations requested and granted on Waterston North, and if the product seems to fit and be moving along, he would tend to be okay with it here. He suggested holding off on final comments on this item until the Commission hears the next item.

The study session was recessed at 6:03 p.m. in order to hold the Regular meeting.

The Study Session reconvened at 6:41 p.m.

Chair Bloomfield felt the presentation on Item 5 for Waterston North addressed most of the concerns for this item.

Commissioner Jones noted the request to reduce the front setbacks and adjust the side setbacks, although there is still a 20' rear setback. He understood the intent to put more space in the back yards, although he didn't really see that come through. He felt it was squeezing houses on smaller lots. Where do they make up for approving the shorter front and side setbacks?

Mr. Newman believed the deeper back yards will provide more space for families and opportunities to have swimming pools, etc. The lot sizes will probably be a little bit bigger, although they will be deeper narrow lots. The trade-off is a few high-quality open space amenities, although we are not sure what that will look like yet. It is designed to provide larger back yards where homeowners could have more space and amenities of their own. These homes will be more narrow than in Waterston North.

Chair Bloomfield felt there were clearly a few questions that could be answered in more detail when this item comes back for a regular hearing. The Commission would be interested in hearing about that potential trade-off. If we are asked to give up something, we generally want something in return. His impression of the whole Waterston project is that it is heavily amenitized with lots of open space and it is gated. People will have a deeper back yard and it is a narrow deep product in order to allow more private space. The goal of their development is to have great amenities in a gated community.

5. ST20-11 WATERSTON NORTH PHASE 1 - PARCEL 3: Five (5) Standard Plans by Maracay Homes for 68 Lots on approximately 19.08 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Appleby Road zoned Single Family-7 (SF-7) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

6. ST20-12 WATERSTON NORTH PHASE 1 - PARCEL 4: Four (4) Standard Plans by Maracay Homes for 95 Lots on approximately 29.69 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Appleby Road zoned Single Family-6 (SF-6) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

ST20-13 WATERSTON NORTH PHASE 1 - PARCEL 6: Four (4) Standard Plans by Maracay Homes for 107 Lots on approximately 25.76 acres generally located at the northwest corner of Val Vista Drive and Ocotillo Road zoned Single Family-D (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Sydney Bethel presented Waterston North Phase I for three sets of standard plans. The project is located at Ocotillo Road and Val Vista Drive. The PAD for this item was approved by Council earlier

this year and the Planning Commission saw the preliminary plat in June. The applicant is proposing three sets of standard plans for Phase I, ranging from SF-7 to SF-D. The ST20-11 is the only one-story plan. There will be three elevation types for all three standard plans including Ranch, Desert Modern and Farmhouse, and each will have four different color palettes. Phase 1 includes 130 lots and the future Phase 2 will have the same standard plans. There are 485 lots total in this subdivision and 270 are planned for these specific standard plans.

Staff is requesting input on the overall elevations, specifically the side and rear elevations, the Ranch style, colors and materials, and approving the standard plans administratively. Items that do not require public notice may be approved administratively by staff subject to approval by the Planning Commission. The final plat for this project is currently under review for three parcels. Phase 2 will include the other three parcels with different standard plans.

The elevation matrix was reviewed. The ST20-11 (SF-7) is the largest home plan, the largest lots, and the only single-story product. Staff requested that more elements indicative of the Ranch style be incorporated as well as an additional material such as stone or brick veneer as seen in the other two plans. Gilbert expects 360-degree architecture on standard plans as well as incorporating some elements from the front façade on the side and rear elevations. Staff was concerned with the two-story Ranch as that style is typically one story. It is important to incorporate some distinguishable features. The ST20-13 (SF-D) is the smallest product on oversized 4,000 SF lots. Staff understands that with smaller products it is difficult to get those defining features. Staff felt the applicant has done a phenomenal job on the Desert Modern elevations. Staff again requested to incorporate elements from the front façade on the side and rear elevations.

There are four color palettes for each elevation style and the same color palette will be used for all three standard plans. Staff requested additional contrasting colors in the base colors. There are some deviations in the accent colors. The Ranch elevation does not have the additional stone or brick as in the Desert Modern and Farmhouse, and staff requested that be added.

Ms. Bethel noted the comments from Chair Bloomfield in the previous item. These standard plans have very similar deviations and modifications as the Waterston Central project. There have not been any issues so far. They did request those deviations with a specific product in mind. These are large developments and it is important to keep the diversity of colors and products since they will be developing a large section of the town.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Bloomfield appreciated staff addressing the comments from the previous case. He also appreciated the comment that this is a very big section of the town and some variation is needed so it doesn't all look the same.

Commissioner Blaser shared staff's concerns and would fully support additional variation on the side and rear elevations as well as additional finishes to add some variation on the Ranch style.

Vice Chair Simon concurred and felt additional variations were definitely needed in the color palette. He felt the terms Ranch and Farmhouse were loosely used. Typically, we would see larger patios or porches in those styles, although we don't see that at all here. He suggested somehow incorporating that and potentially extending the back patios to dress it up. It is a very large swath and he felt it could be broken up somehow. Perhaps that will come in the second phase.

Commissioner Jones was familiar with the Waterston South project and was pleased with it. These are different elevations and it seemed plain. We need something that will last. He fully supported staff's comments to dress these up and make them a little more distinctive.

Commissioner Andersen felt the rest of the Commission hit all of his points.

7. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda

There was a request to move Item 14. FM20-02 PB Bell Gilbert Commons Separation Fence to the Consent Agenda, although there was an administrative reason why that item needed to be heard in the Non-Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Andersen advised that he will recuse himself from Item 12. FM20-03 Acero Val Vista Separation Fence.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

Chair Bloomfield wished all a Merry Christmas. He acknowledged that our new Mayor-elect Brigitte Peterson attended the meeting. Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Study Session at 6:59 p.m.

Carl Bloomfield, Chairman

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
DECEMBER 2, 2020**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Chair
Jän Simon, Vice Chair
Brian Andersen
David Blaser
William Fay
Tyler Jones
Noah Mundt
Anthony Bianchi, Alternate

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Colby Ashton, Alternate

STAFF PRESENT:

Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Stephanie Bubenheim, Senior Planner
Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Keith Newman, Planner II
Tom Condit, Development Engineering Manager
Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney

RECORDER:

Dana Desing

MAYOR AND COUNCIL PRESENT:

Mayor-Elect Brigitte Peterson
Councilmember Scott September

PLANNER	CASE	PAGE	VOTE
Keith Newman	DR20-87	2	Approved
Sydney Bethel	DR20-138	3	Approved
Sydney Bethel	FM20-03	3	Approved
Sydney Bethel	DR20-117	3	Approved
Keith Newman	FM20-02	4	Approved

CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING

Chair Carl Bloomfield called the December 2, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:13 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Planning Division Manager Eva Cutro led the Pledge of Allegiance

ROLL CALL

Eva Cutro called roll and determined that a quorum was present.

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chair Bloomfield called for a motion to approve the agenda.

MOTION: Vice Chair Simon moved to approve the Agenda as presented; seconded by Commissioner Mundt. **Motion passed 7-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

8. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS:

At this time, members of the public may comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Town but not on the agenda. The Commission/Board response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon, or asking that a matter be put on a future agenda.

There were no requests to speak.

9. REPORT FROM COUNCIL LIAISON ON CURRENT EVENTS:

Councilmember Scott September hoped that everyone had a fantastic Thanksgiving with family and friends. It has been a long year and we all deserved some quiet downtime. He wished everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)

All items listed below are considered the public hearing consent calendar. The Commission/Board may, by a single motion, approve any number of items where, after opening the public hearing, no person requests the item be removed from the consent calendar. If such a request is made, the Commission/Board shall then withdraw the item from the public hearing consent calendar for the purpose of public discussion and separate action. Other items on the agenda may be added to the consent calendar and approved under a single motion.

Commissioner Andersen declared a conflict for Item 12, FM20-03 Acero Val Vista Separation Fence, and will recuse himself on that item.

10. DR20-87 PB BELL GILBERT COMMONS: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 21.13 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Cooper and Baselines Roads, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) and Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR20-87, PB Bell Gilbert Commons: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 21.13 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Cooper and Baseline Roads, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) and Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission/Design Review Board at the December 2, 2020 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site

Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.

3. Monument signage has been included in this approval and will require a sign permit prior to construction.
4. The proposed monument sign at the main entrance to the development shall be revised to not exceed a total of 32 sq. ft. of sign area.
5. The Design Review approval is subject to approval of a variance per LDC Article 5.5 and an Engineering technical variance per the Engineering Standards Section 1.8. Should these variances modifying the maximum retention basin depth and slope not be approved, an amendment to this Design Review case will be required that shows compliance with the requirements of the Land Development Code and Engineering Standards and any engineering technical variance required by the Engineering Standards Section 1.8.

11. DR20-138 BILL LUKE SANTAN PHASE II: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 7.12 acres, generally located within the Santan Motorplex at the northwest corner of Speedway Drive and Motorplex Loop, in the General Commercial (GC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR20-138, Bill Luke Santan Phase II-Detailing Building: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 7.12 acres, generally located within the Santan Motorplex at the northwest corner of Speedway Drive and Motorplex Loop, in the General Commercial (GC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the December 2, 2020 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. All signage shall comply with the Master Sign Program for the Santan Motorplex.

12. FM20-03 ACERO VAL VISTA SEPARATION FENCE: Request to approve modifications to separation fence requirements to allow a 6' view fence on the northern boundary of the subject site on approximately 13.41 acres, generally located at the northeast corner of the Melrose Street alignment and Quartz Street, and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Make the Findings of Fact and approve FM20-03, Acero Val Vista Separation Fence: FM20- 03 ACERO VAL VISTA SEPARATION FENCE: Request to approve modifications to separation fence requirements to allow a 6' view fence on the northern boundary of the subject site on approximately 13.41 acres, generally located at the northeast corner of the Melrose Street alignment and Quartz Street, and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M), subject to the following conditions.

1. The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and wall detail shown on the Exhibits provided under Attachment No. 4.

13. DR20-117 BANNER GATEWAY MEDICAL EXPANSION & RENOVATION: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for the expansion of the existing Banner Gateway Medical campus. The expansion includes a new patient tower, expansion to the existing D&T facility, and three (3) new surface parking lots on

approximately 63.5 acres, generally located at the northwest corner of Higley Road and Banner Gateway Drive, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Findings of Fact and approve DR20-117, Banner Gateway Medical Expansion & Renovations: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for the expansion of the existing Banner Gateway Medical campus. The expansion includes a new patient tower, expansion to the existing diagnostic and treatment (D&T) facility, and three (3) new surface parking lots on approximately 63.5 acres, generally located at the northwest corner of Higley Road and Banner Gateway Drive, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC), subject to conditions:

1. Construction of the project shall conform to the exhibits approved by the Planning Commission at the December 2, 2020 public hearing.
2. The construction site plan documents shall incorporate the Standard Commercial and Industrial Site Plan Notes adopted by the Design Review Board on March 11, 2004.
3. Signage is not included in this approval. All signage shall comply with the Master Sign Program for the Banner Gateway Medical Campus (DR06-121-B).

Chair Bloomfield read the Consent Agenda items and called for a motion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Simon moved to recommend approval of Consent Agenda Items **10. DR20-87** PB Bell Gilbert Commons, **11. DR20-138** Bill Luke Santan Phase II, and **13. DR20-117** Banner Gateway Medical Expansion & Renovation, as presented; seconded by Commissioner Jones. **Motion passed 7-0.**

MOTION: Vice Chair Simon moved to recommend approval of Consent Agenda Item **12. FM20-03** Acero Val Vista Separation Fence, as presented; seconded by Commissioner Jones. **Motion passed 6-0** with Commissioner Andersen abstaining from the vote.

PUBLIC HEARING (NON-CONSENT)

Non-Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at an individual public hearing and will be acted upon by the Commission/Board by a separate motion. During the Public Hearings, anyone wishing to comment in support of or in opposition to a Public Hearing item may do so. If you wish to comment on a Public Hearing Item you must fill out a public comment form, indicating the Item Number on which you wish to be heard. Once the hearing is closed, there will be no further public comment unless requested by a member of the Commission/Board.

14. FM20-02 PB BELL GILBERT COMMONS SEPARATION FENCE: Request to approve modifications to separation fence requirements on approximately 8.63 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Cooper and Baseline Roads, and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) within the Gilbert Commons Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Make the Findings of Fact and approve FM20-02, PB BELL GILBERT COMMONS SEPARATION FENCE: Request to approve modifications to separation fence requirements on approximately 8.63 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Cooper and Baseline Roads, and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) within the Shoppes at Gilbert Commons Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to conditions:

1. The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and wall detail shown on the Exhibits provided under Attachment No. 4.

2. The Separation Fence approval is subject to approval of a variance per LDC Article 5.5 and an Engineering technical variance per the Engineering Standards Section 1.8. Should these variances modifying the maximum retention basin depth and slope not be approved, an amendment to this Separation Fence Modification case will be required that shows compliance with the requirements of the Land Development Code and Engineering Standards and any engineering technical variance required by the Engineering Standards Section 1.8.

Chair Bloomfield opened the public hearing and invited staff to give a presentation.

Planner Keith Newman presented FM20-02 PB Bell Gilbert Commons Separation Fence, located within the Gilbert Commons Shopping Center. The requests are 1) to allow a separation wall to be constructed within the required 17'10" perimeter landscape area; 2) to allow a 6'1" tall wall where 8' is required adjacent to a non-residential district or use; 3) to allow for the top 3'6" of the proposed wall to be view fencing; 4) to allow a 3'6" view fence instead of an 8' solid wall along an SRP wall west of the property; and 5) to allow for no fencing along the northern portion of the retention basin.

Mr. Newman stated the retention basin is existing on the site today located next to an SRP substation which has a 10' wall. Once the retention basin clears the substation wall, it opens up into a much wider basin with a curve. The slopes of the basin are an existing condition today. The basin was constructed in the early 2000's and retains regional drainage for the Shoppes at Gilbert Commons Center as well as three or four lots in the Fuller Industrial Park. The fence proposed along the western boundary is actually close to the SRP substation. As it goes further north, the property line is almost in the middle of the retention basin. The request to have no wall is appropriate in the middle of a retention basin. The proposed partial view fence will be 2.5' of CMU with 3.5' of wrought iron on top and will be located in the middle of the existing retention basin. The 3'6" view fence is mainly in front of the SRP substation with the 10' wall.

The applicant is proposing to install parking along that western boundary at the edge of the basin where the slopes end currently. They are essentially filling in portion of the existing and modifying the slopes to accommodate the parking stalls. The separation view fence will act as a retaining wall. The landscape setback was approved by Council at 17' 10". The proposed wall would be barely within that landscape area, which is typically not allowed per code. Given the retention basin and its existing condition, staff felt this was a reasonable request. The slopes of the basins do not meet LDC requirements for a four to one slope. The applicant cannot meet that requirement given the retaining wall at the lower portion of the slope. The applicant also cannot meet the LDC requirements for the depth of the basin and they are proposing a depth of 7' as measured from the grade adjacent to the parking stalls. The portion in front of the SRP substation does meet the depth and slope requirements, but it does not north of the substation. Due to the existing conditions and the LDC requirements that cannot be met, it was determined that LDC variances are needed for the depth and modified slopes of the new basin as well as a technical variance from the engineering standards. Those processes would typically happen before an item comes before the Commission for a separation fence modification and a Design Review application. In these extraordinary circumstances, we did not know what the final design would be for the basin and the slopes until very recently. Staff has proposed a condition that states they have to submit these variances, and if not approved, they will be required to modify their site to comply with the LDC in its entirety. The two variances will be considered concurrently. one by Public Works and one by the Zoning Hearing Officer.

Staff recommends approval of the separation fence modifications and feels that the applicant does meet all findings of fact, given the extraordinary circumstances and existing condition of the basin that has been in place for many years. Staff feels this is a good design and worked with the applicant to come up with a happy medium for the design. Staff is agreeable to this design and recommends approval with the two

conditions. Tom Condit was on the line to answer any technical engineering questions.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Mundt noted that there needs to be a certain amount of standing water that would allow it to percolate through. He did not know if an underground storage or other diversion would work. He asked what the scale of alterations would be in order to meet the code. That may provide a clear picture as to why this makes sense.

Mr. Newman stated they will provide underground retention tanks in order to replace the volume from the slopes that will be modified.

Tom Condit, Development Engineering Manager, noted this has been reviewed by many town staff over the past two weeks. The applicant submitted a drainage report as well as a grading and drainage plan to show the implications of the requested changes. The existing basin holds about 260K cubic feet of water and the proposed changes will reduce that by just under 30K cubic feet. They are proposing to place that retention in the underground tanks on the northwest corner of the site. The current basin depth is 3' and the applicant is requesting 3.75' of ponding depth. That was not something he had anticipated but found during his review and will discuss that with the applicant further. This does look like something they are able to handle and could be approved through a technical variance process.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Applicant Ralph Pew, Pew & Lake, PLC, advised that it has been a two-year process to get here. They agree with staff's recommendation and conditions. These issues occurred because this retention basin was built in the early 2000's. Our site adjoins an SRP substation with a 10' block wall. Half of the retention basin that we cannot disturb is technically owned by a defunct corporation that has not been in existence for years. They underwent a massive effort with engineers and town staff to design the wall to accommodate five very unusual circumstances in what used to be the back side of the Gilbert Commons Shopping Center. That will now become a much more pleasing parking lot and landscaped area for the tenants and residents of the Gilbert Commons Multi-Family project by PB Bell. He urged the Commission's approval. They will file the application for the LDC and technical variances immediately. They are excited to bring this project to fruition.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The phone lines were opened for public comment. There were none.

Chair Bloomfield closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the dais. With no further discussion, Chair Bloomfield entertained a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Mundt moved to make the Findings of Fact and approve FM20-02, PB Bell Gilbert Commons Separation Fence: Request to approve modifications to separation fence requirements on approximately 8.63 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Cooper and Baseline Roads, and zoned Multi-Family/Medium (MF/M) within the Shoppes at Gilbert Commons Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to Conditions 1 and 2 on Page 9 of the Staff Report; seconded by Vice Chair Simon.
Motion passed 7-0.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

15. Planning Commission Minutes - Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of November 4, 2020.

MOTION: Vice Chair Simon moved to approve the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of November 4, 2020; seconded by Commissioner Blaser. **Motion passed 7-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

16. Executive Session – The Public Body may convene into an executive session at one or more times during the meeting as needed to confer with the Town Attorney for legal advice regarding any of the items listed on the agenda as authorized by A.R.S. §38-431.03.A.3.

An Executive Session was not held.

17. Report from Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events:

Chair Bloomfield thanked members of the Commission for their service and taking time out of their schedules to review the staff reports

18. Report from Planning Services Manager on current events:

Eva Cutro congratulated Sydney Bethel for passing the American Institute of Certified Planners exam. Her title is now AICP.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:41 p.m.

Carl Bloomfield, Chairman

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary